

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated **June 13, 2007** and is being concurrently filed with an RCE. Each of the issues in the Office Action is addressed below. Currently claims 1-29 are pending in the application with claims 8-9, 11-12, 14 and 28 standing withdrawn.

§102 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 10, 13, 15-17, 18-20 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Duchamp (US 6575934). A full account of the rejection is found on page 3 of the Office Action.

In order to further prosecution to issuance, independent claim 1 has been amended consistent with Applicant's phone conversation with the Examiner on July 10, 2007, to further distinguish it and the claims dependent thereon from the cited reference. The amendments are consistent with the Examiner's suggestion in the "Suggested Allowable Subject Matter" section of the office action on page 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

§103 Rejections

Claims 5 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duchamp. A full account of the rejection is found on page 4 of the Office Action.

As mentioned above, claim 1, on which claims 5 and 21-22 depend, has been amended to further distinguish it from the cited reference. Therefore, for at least this reason, dependent claims 5 and 21-22 are similarly patentable over the cited reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duchamp in view of Larson et al. (US 6048338). A full account of the rejection is found on page 4 of the Office Action.

As mentioned above, claim 1, on which claims 6-7 depend, has been amended to further distinguish it from Duchamp. Therefore, for at least this reason, dependent claims 6-7 are

similarly patentable over Duchamp. Duchamp does not substantially disclose the claimed invention as asserted in the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection

Claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamilton et al. (US 6368301). A full account of the rejection is found on page 5 of the Office Action.

Although Applicant disagrees, claim 23 has been amended to further clarify the claim and further distinguish it from the cited reference. The amendments further define the term “about” in the claim. The amendments are consistent with Applicant’s discussions with the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

§103 Rejections

Claims 26-27 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al. A full account of the rejection is found on page 6 of the Office Action.

As mentioned above, claim 23, on which claims 26-27 depend, has been amended to further distinguish it from Hamilton et al. Therefore, for at least this reason, dependent claims 26-27 are similarly patentable over Hamilton et al. Hamilton et al. do not substantially disclose the claimed invention as asserted in the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Miscellaneous

In light of the amendments to claim 1, claims 13 and 15 have been canceled as being duplicative and the dependence of claims 16 and 18-20 have been amended as a result of the cancellation of claims 13 and 15.

The application should now be in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited. If the Examiner would like to further discuss the case, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: August 13, 2007

/William E. Anderson II/
By: _____
William E. Anderson II
Registration No.: 37766

6640 Shady Oak Dr., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\wea\10888us01_and_20070813.doc